

REMARKS

The Office Action has been received and reviewed. In the Office Action, (A) figures 1A and 1B were objected to, (B) claims 1-23, 25-35, 37 and 41-45 were rejected, and (C) claims 24, 36 and 38-40 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, and (D) claims 24, 36 and 38-40 were deemed allowable.

I. Objection To The Drawings

At section 1 of the Office Action, the drawings were objected to. The Examiner requested new drawings corresponding to Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B. Enclosed are the formal drawings for Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B.

II. Rejections And Objections To The Claims

At section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-23, 25-35, 37 and 41-45 were rejected. At section 30 of the Office Action, claims 24, 36 and 38-40 were objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim. It was noted in section 30 that claims 24, 36 and 38-40 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims in order to expedite issuance of a *Notice Of Allowance* and minimize costs associated with prosecuting the application. No other reason should be attributed to the amendments. In particular, the amendments to the claims should not be viewed as agreeing that Chase in view of Kostoff et al. is a proper foundation for the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 24. Various amendments to the claims that are

dependent from claim 1 have been made in order to account for the amendment to claim 1. Since original claim 24 was deemed allowable in the Office Action, it is respectfully requested that claims 1 through 36 be allowed.

Claim 37 was amended to include the limitations of original claim 38. Various amendments to the claims that are dependent from claim 37 have been made in order to account for the amendment to claim 37. Since original claim 38 was deemed allowable in the Office Action, it is respectfully requested that claims 37 through 43 be allowed.

Claim 44 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. It is respectfully requested that claim 44 be allowed.

Claim 45 has been amended to include limitations similar to those found in original claim 38. Since original claim 38 was deemed allowable in the Office Action, it is respectfully requested that claims 45 be allowed.

Claim 46 is a new claim, which includes the limitations of original claim 1 and original claim 36. Since original claim 36 was deemed allowable in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that claim 46 is allowable. Since claims 47 through 79 depend from claim 46, they include the limitations of claim 46. Therefore, claims 47 through 79 are allowable. It is respectfully requested that claims 46 through 79 be allowed.

In view of the amendments Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted a full and complete response to the Office

Action has been made. The claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant believes that a fee and petition for a three-month extension of time is due with this Response. A check for the amount of the fee (\$510) is enclosed, along with the petition for a three-month extension of time.

The Applicant also believes a fee is due as a result of the amendments to the claims. The fee for the claims should be charged to deposit account 08-2442. Taking into consideration the claims paid for upon filing the application, Applicant believes the fee for the claims is \$875.

If additional fees are due, please charge Deposit Account No. 08-2442.

The Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney if any questions remain following review of this response.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Kent Roberts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,786

Date: December 29, 2004

Hodgson Russ LLP
One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, NY 14203-2391